



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,493	07/11/2003	Luz Montesclaros	5063 US	5407

22896 7590 12/07/2007  
MILA KASAN, PATENT DEPT.  
APPLIED BIOSYSTEMS  
850 LINCOLN CENTRE DRIVE  
FOSTER CITY, CA 94404

EXAMINER

SCHNIZER, RICHARD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1635

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/618,493	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MONTESCLAROS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Richard Schnizer, Ph. D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1635	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20, 21 and 23-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20, 21, and 23-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/24/07 has been entered.

Claims 1-18, 20, 21, and 23-33 remain pending and are under consideration in this Office Action.

### ***Request for Interview***

At page 5 of the response filed 10/24/07, Applicant set forth a request for an interview in the event that the application was not found to be in condition for allowance. This request was attached to an amendment which must be acted on by the Office in a timely fashion. In the future, Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner directly to arrange any interviews prior to the submission of amendments, so that any remaining issues can be discussed in a timely fashion.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1635

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 14-18, 20, 21, and 23-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuipers et al (Ann. Rheum. Dis. 58: 103-108, 1999) in view of Domanico et al (US Published Application 20040180445).

Kuipers taught a method of isolating Chlamydia genomic DNA by treatment of synovial fluid with proteinase K and a nonionic detergent, addition of this mixture to a solid support, and elution of DNA from the support. See abstract; Fig. 1 on page 104, method 4a; see also page 104 last paragraph to page 105, second full paragraph of column 1.

Kuipers also taught methods of isolating Chlamydia genomic DNA by treatment of synovial fluid with proteinase K and either an ionic or a nonionic detergent, addition of the cationic lipid CTAB, addition of a solid support, and elution of the DNA from the support. See abstract; Fig. 1 on page 104, e.g. methods 3b, 3c, 4b, and 4c; see also second and third full paragraphs of column 2 on page 104; and first two full paragraphs on page 105.

Kuipers did not teach a zwitterionic detergent or a chaotrope, and did not disclose wash solutions.

Domanico taught compositions for gently lysing and solubilizing a host cell comprising: a buffering agent, a zwitterionic detergent, and a chaotropic salt. See abstract and claim 8. Domanico also stated that the compositions could be used for preferential isolation of high molecular weight nucleic acids. See paragraph 13 at page

Art Unit: 1635

2. Host cells include mammalian cells, see paragraph 30 on page 2. Zwitterionic detergents taught by Domanico include n-Tetradecyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, n-Octyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, n-Dodecyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, Anzergent 3-14, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-8, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-10, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-12, Analytical Grade, respectively or zwittergent 3-8, zwittergent 3-10, zwittergent 3-12 and zwittergent 3-14, CHAPS, CHAPSO, Apo10 and Apo12. See paragraph 53 on page 5. Disclosed chaotropic agents include guanidine hydrochloride, guanidine thiocyanate, urea, and sodium iodide. It is also clear from the teachings of Domanico that non-ionic and zwitterionic detergents could be used as alternatives to lyse cells in DNA isolation procedures. See e.g. paragraph 9 on page 1. Domanico also exemplified the use of two chaotropes together in a single lysis buffer.

Domanico also taught wash solutions comprising Tris buffer salts and alcohols, and alkaline elution buffers, for use with DNA-binding silica matrices. See e.g. abstract; paragraphs 36, 72, and 73.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute a zwitterionic detergent for the nonionic detergent in the method of Kuipers because Domanico taught that non-ionic and zwitterionic detergents could be used as alternatives to lyse cells in DNA isolation procedures. See e.g. paragraph 9 on page 1. In fact, Domanico taught that the choice of detergents was a result-effective variable and explored the use of various different detergents and detergent mixtures, including a mixture of an ionic and a non-ionic detergent (see e.g. paragraphs 99 and

Art Unit: 1635

109 on page 9, and Table 5 on page 10. In view of the fact that use of non-ionic, anionic, cationic, and zwitterionic detergents in combination was known in the art at the time of the invention, and the fact that it was recognized that the identity of the detergents used influenced results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the detergent content of a nucleic acid isolation mixture in order to maximize nucleic acid yield and purity. Similarly, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that chaotropic compounds were useful in the isolation of nucleic acids from cells, e.g. Domanico taught that chaotropic salts were useful in nucleic acid isolation procedures to drive the binding of nucleic acid to a solid support matrix (see paragraph 44), and taught the use of two chaotropes together in a single lysis buffer. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the chaotropes of Domanico in the method of Kuipers to aid in the binding of the DNA to the solid support.

Pertinent to claims 21 and 23-31, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to organize into a kit the elements of the invention of Kuipers as modified by Domanico because one of ordinary skill in the art appreciates that organizing experimental reagents prior to use is standard laboratory practice which reduces the frequency of errors and so saves time. Moreover, because Kuipers used a solid silica support to bind DNA, it would have been obvious to use the wash solutions of Domanico that are designed for washing and eluting DNA from silica supports. See e.g. paragraph 36.

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuipers et al (Ann. Rheum. Dis. 58: 103-108, 1999) and Domanico et al (US Published Application 20040180445) as applied to claims 1-8, 14-18, 20, 21, and 23-31 above, and further in view of Gautsch et al (US Patent 6,235,501).

The teachings of Kuipers (1999) and Domanico are discussed above and can be combined to render obvious a method of isolating Chlamydia genomic DNA from synovial fluid using a protease, a zwitterionic detergent, a chaotropic agent, and a solid support.

While Kuipers taught the use of the cationic detergent CTAB in methods of genomic DNA isolation in conjunction with the use of a solid phase (see Fig. 1 on page 104, especially methods 4b and 4c), these methods require organic extraction prior to application of the DNA to the solid phase. This extraction would likely remove at least the protease from the lysate, such that the combination applied to the solid phase would not comprise a protease. For this reason, the combined references did not teach application of the claimed combination to the solid phase.

Gautsch taught the use of CTAB in lysis methods wherein the lysate is subsequently applied to a solid phase for binding and purification of DNA, (see e.g. claims 24 and 37) but Gautsch did not teach any organic extraction of the CTAB-containing lysate prior to application to the solid phase. It follows that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would realize that the lysates comprising CTAB can be applied directly to a solid phase for DNA purification, and that the organic extraction steps of Kuipers methods 4b and 4c are not required, and can be omitted.

One would be motivated to omit the extraction step in order to save time and reagents. It would have been similarly obvious to modify the method of Kuipers by adding a zwitterionic detergent and one or more chaotropes for the reasons set forth in the previous rejection. The resulting mixture would comprise the protease, the zwitterion, the chaotrope(s) and CTAB at the time it was applied to the solid phase. Thus the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious.

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuipers et al (Ann. Rheum. Dis. 58: 103-108, 1999) and Domanico et al (US Published Application 20040180445) as applied to claims 1-8, 14-18, 20, 21, and 23-31 above, and further in view of Kuipers et al (Arthritis and Rheumatism, (1998 Oct) Vol. 41, No. 10, pp. 1894-5).

The teachings of Kuipers (1999) and Domanico are discussed above and can be combined to render obvious a method of isolating Chlamydia genomic DNA from synovial fluid using a protease, a zwitterionic detergent, a chaotropic agent, and a solid support.

These references did not teach isolation of nucleic acids from blood.

Kuipers (1998) taught a method of detecting Chlamydia genomic DNA from peripheral blood leukocytes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the DNA isolation procedure of Kuipers as modified by Domanico to blood or to any other tissue with a reasonable expectation of success Domanico taught



that the combination of a zwitterionic detergent and chaotropic agent could be used to lyse a wide variety of cells including mammalian cells, insect cells, and bacterial cells. There is no reason to doubt that the method could be used to isolate DNA from blood cells.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/07 have been fully considered as they apply to the grounds of rejection set forth above but they are not persuasive.

At page 2 of the response, Applicant disagrees that it would have been obvious to substitute a zwitterionic detergent for a nonionic detergent, and to evaluate the combination of zwitterionic and nonionic detergents in cell lysis procedures. Applicant argues that zwitterionic detergents function differently than ionic detergents. For support Applicant relies on the specification at page 3, last sentence of the first paragraph, which teaches that most nonionic detergents such as Triton X, Tween 20, and NP-40 are less effective than ionic detergents at disrupting protein aggregates. This is unpersuasive. This passage does not indicate that nonionic detergents are non-functional at disrupting protein aggregates, or more importantly, that nonionic and zwitterionic detergents cannot be used as alternatives to lyse host cells. The rejection states that it would have been obvious to substitute a zwitterionic detergent for the nonionic detergent in the method of Kuipers because Domanico taught that non-ionic and zwitterionic detergents could be used as alternatives to lyse cells in DNA isolation procedures. See e.g. Domanico at paragraph 9 on page 1. Applicant has presented no

evidence that a zwitterionic detergent could not be substituted for a nonionic detergent in a method of cell lysis.

Applicant also indicates at page 2, second paragraph that there is a "specific different result between using zwitterionic compounds and nonionic compounds", referring to Fig. 2. Fig. 2 shows that 2-3 micrograms of genomic DNA was recovered in purification protocols using any one of 3 zwitterionic detergents, whereas substitution of a nonionic detergent resulted in recovery of 0-0.5 micrograms. Detergents were used at a concentration of 2% without further optimization (see specification at pages 32 and 33). So within the conditions of the experiment, the yield of DNA was greater when zwitterionic detergents were used than when non-ionic detergents were used, but either could be used to obtain DNA, generally. It is also clear from Domanico that non-ionic and zwitterionic detergents could be used as alternatives to lyse cells in DNA isolation procedures, that the choice of detergents was a result-effective variable, and that it was routine to explore the use of various different detergents and detergent mixtures in the process of optimizing cell lysis and DNA recovery. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to optimize the detergents used in the method of Kuipers. It is noted that claims 1, 4, and 32 do not require a chaotrope, and that the experiment in Fig. 2 was performed to determine the effect of detergents on DNA binding to a solid support in the presence of a chaotrope. Accordingly, if Applicant intends to argue that the claims are not obvious due to unexpected results, this would be unpersuasive because the conditions of the experiment are not commensurate in scope with the claims.

Art Unit: 1635

At page 3, Applicant indicates that previous arguments set forth 1/11/07 were not directed to limitations not in the claims (i.e. preferential isolation of high molecular weight DNA) but to show that the present invention directs to a different result than that of Domanico, since Domanico taught isolation of low molecular weight DNAs. This is unpersuasive for the reasons of record. The claims do not require preferential isolation of high molecular weight DNA, so arguments based on preferential isolation of high molecular weight DNA are based on limitations not present in the claims. Also, Domanico was relied upon to teach methods of cell lysis, not isolation of DNA of any particular size. Absent evidence to the contrary, the lysis solutions of Domanico would allow isolation of either or both of high and low molecular weight nucleic acids, depending on method steps subsequent to lysis. Absent evidence to the contrary the lysis solutions of Domanico would allow isolation of high molecular weight DNAs when combined with the teachings of Kuipers. Applicant has presented no evidence to the contrary. Applicant's conclusion that "substituting the nonionic detergent in Kuipers' method with zwitterionic detergent taught by Domanico will not make Kuipers' method work" lacks logical or evidentiary support and is unpersuasive. The method of Kuipers works without the zwitterionic detergent. It is unclear why one of ordinary skill would expect it to not work if a zwitterionic detergent is substituted for the nonionic detergent. If it is Applicant's position that the substitution of the zwitterionic detergent for the nonionic detergent will make the method of Kuipers' non-functional, then this argument lacks any support.

At page 3, Applicant maintains arguments that the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation for omitting the extraction step, and argues that the rejection is based on hindsight. Applicant indicates that there is no suggestion in the primary references for the combination, and one of skill in the art would not be motivated to apply material to the solid phase without the instant invention. The Examiner reiterates that one of ordinary skill, aware of the teachings of Gautsch, would have been motivated to omit the extraction step because Gautsch omitted it, showing that it was not necessary.

Gautsch, like Kuipers, taught the use of CTAB in lysis methods wherein the lysate is subsequently applied to a solid phase for binding and purification of DNA, (see e.g. claims 24 and 37) but Gautsch did not teach any organic extraction of the CTAB-containing lysate prior to application to the solid phase. It follows that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would realize that lysates comprising CTAB can be applied directly to a solid phase for DNA purification and that the organic extraction steps of Kuipers methods 4b and 4c are not required, and can be omitted. MPEP 2144.04 (II)(A) indicates that it is obvious to omit steps that are not required. Applicant appears to argue at the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 3 that the omission of the extraction step does not only save time, it also has a positive effect on sample quality. This is unpersuasive because it lacks support and appears to be only a statement of opinion. Applicant is reminded that the motivation for modifying the prior art need not be the same as Applicant's motivation.

Regarding claims 21 and 23-31, Applicant asserts at page 4 that none of these claims includes phenol/chloroform, ethanol, or chloroform as do Kuipers methods 3b,

3c, 4b, and 4c. This is unpersuasive because the claims do not exclude these reagents either. Applicant also states that the Examiner's assertion that one of ordinary skill would have considered the organization of reagents into a kit to be an obvious means of avoiding errors is unsubstantiated. However, MPEP 2144.03(C) states that to adequately traverse a finding of obviousness based on common knowledge (e.g. that organization of reagents into kits saves time and reduces errors) an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the Examiner's action, which should include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well known in the art. Applicant has not stated why organizing reagents into a kit in order to save time and reduce errors would not have been recognized as common knowledge to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Note also that MPEP 2144.02 indicates that the rationale to support a rejection under 35 USC 103 may rely on logic and sound scientific principle. The fact that the organizing of reagents leads to fewer errors is considered to be a logic scientific principle that is apparent to those of ordinary skill. Further, MPEP 2144 indicates that the rationale supporting a rejection may be reasoned from common knowledge in the art. MPEP 2111.04(D) indicates that actions in which evidence is newly introduced to support such reasoning may be made final. Evidence that it is obvious to organize reagents into a kit comes from Ahern (1995) (retrieved from [http://www.the-scientist.library.upenn.edu/yr1995/july/tools\\_950724.html](http://www.the-scientist.library.upenn.edu/yr1995/july/tools_950724.html)) who taught that reagent kits offer allow scientists to better manage their time without focusing excessively on technical considerations. See title page 3, first four paragraphs, and page 4, first 4 paragraphs.

Art Unit: 1635

Applicant addresses the rejection of claims 32 and 33 at pages 4 and 5, reiterating arguments that were unpersuasive for the reasons set forth above.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14,15, 17, 18, 21 and 23-30 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-64 of U.S. Patent No. 6,762,027. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

The claims of '027 are drawn to methods and kits for methods and kits for contacting whole tissue with a disrupting buffer comprising a protease and a cationic surfactant, substantially neutralizing the surfactant, and binding the nucleic acid to a solid phase. The specification teaches at column 10, lines 8-18 that "substantially neutralizing" embraces addition of one or more of chaotropes, nonionic surfactants, anionic surfactants, and zwitterionic surfactants. So, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1635

through routine optimization to assess the activity of various combinations of chaotropes, nonionic surfactants, anionic surfactants, and zwitterionic surfactants, such as those required in instant claims 5-7, 11, 12, and 15. Claim 5 of '027 requires the use of the cationic surfactants of instant claims 10, 12, and 13. Claim 7 of '027 requires the use of a chaotrope selected from the group: NaBr, NaI, NaSCN, LiCl, LiBr, LiI, GuHCl, and GuSCN. Claim 25 of '027 requires isolating the bound nucleic acid, i.e. eluting it from the solid support. It is clear from the specification as a whole the claimed methods result in isolating genomic DNAs, see e.g. the brief descriptions of Figs. 13-30, at columns 3 and 4. Claim 15 of '027 requires the use of proteinases selected from proteinase K, proteinase, R, proteinase T, subtilisin DY, an alkaline serine protease from *Streptomyces griseus*, an alkaline serine protease from *Bacillus licheniformis*, dispase, subtilisin Carlsberg, subtilopeptidase A, and thermolysin.

'027 does not teach a kit with wash or elution solutions, however, claims 25-40 require elution of the nucleic acid from the solid support. The portion of the specification supporting these claims teaches that solid supports comprising DNA were washed in 90% ethanol and DNA was eluted in an alkaline solution buffered with Tris HCl and with a second solution of NaOH. See column 36. lines 31-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the wash and elution solutions to the kits of the '027 patent simply because these solutions allow isolation of nucleic acids purified by the methods claimed in the '027 patent.

Claims 4, 13, 16, 20, and 31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-64 of U.S. Patent No. 6,762,027 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-12, 14,15, 17-19, and 21-30 above, and further in view of Domanico et al (US Published Application 20040180445). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

The teachings of the '027 patent are discussed above. Although '027 teaches zwitterionic surfactants, it does not exemplify any.

Domanico taught a method of isolating nucleic acids from bacterial, insect or mammalian cells by treating the cells with a lysis solution comprising guanidine hydrochloride, guanidine thiocyanate, and the zwitterionic detergent N-decyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, and binding the nucleic acid to a solid matrix such as glass beads. See e.g. abstract, paragraph 30 on page 2, Table 3 at page 8, and e.g. paragraphs 99-109 on page 9. Other zwitterionic detergents taught by Domanico include n-Tetradecyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, n-Octyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, n-Dodecyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, Anzergent 3-14, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-8, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-10, Analytical Grade; Anzergent 3-12, Analytical Grade, respectively or zwittergent 3-8, zwittergent 3-10, zwittergent 3-12 and zwittergent 3-14, CHAPS, CHAPSO, Apo10 and Apo12. See paragraph 53 on page 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the zwitterionic detergents of Domanico in the methods and kits of '027



Art Unit: 1635

because the claims of '027 require substantial neutralization of a cationic surfactant, and the specification of '027 teaches at column 10, lines 8-18 that "substantially neutralizing" embraces addition of one or more of chaotropes, nonionic surfactants, anionic surfactants, and zwitterionic surfactants. The zwitterionic surfactants of Domanico are used in a similar method, so it would have been clear to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use them in the methods and kits of the '027 patent. Regarding the tissue sources of instant claim 20, the "tissue" of the '027 claims includes biopsy materials and aspirates; in vitro cultured cells, including primary and secondary cells, transformed cell lines, and tissue and cellular explants; lymph; and body fluids such as urine, sputum, semen, secretions, eye washes and aspirates, lung washes and aspirates.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's request to hold the rejection in abeyance until allowable subject matter is identified is noted.

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

This is a request for continued examination of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/618493. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS**

**MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner(s) should be directed to Richard Schnizer, whose telephone number is 571-272-0762. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between the hours of 6:00 AM and 3:30 PM. The examiner is off on alternate Fridays, but is sometimes in the office anyway.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, J. Douglas Schultz, can be reached at (571) 272-0763. The official central fax number is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system

Art Unit: 1635

provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Schnizer', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Richard Schnizer, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1635